
A
LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND THE
Lord Bishop of GLOUCESTER;

IN WHICH

The *Divine Legation* of MOSES
IS VINDICATED,

As well from the
MISAPPREHENSIONS of his Lordship's FRIENDS,
AS THE
MISREPRESENTATIONS of his ENEMIES, &c.

(Price One Shilling.)

LETTER



THE DIRECTOR

THE DIRECTOR

THE DIRECTOR

18648 K.R., a.c.

A
LETTER

TO THE
RIGHT REVEREND THE
Lord Bishop of GLOUCESTER;

IN WHICH
The *Divine Legation* of MOSES
IS VINDICATED,

As well from the
MISAPPREHENSIONS of his Lordship's FRIENDS,
AS THE
MISREPRESENTATIONS of his ENEMIES:

And in which
His LORDSHIP'S MERITS as a WRITER
Are clearly proved
To be far superior to the ENCOMIUMS
OF HIS
WARMEST ADMIRERS.

Hi motus Animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta,
Pulveris exigui jactu, compressa quiescunt.

VIRG.

L O N D O N,

Printed for W. NICOLL, at the Paper-Mill, in St.
Paul's Church-Yard. MDCCLXVII.

[Price One Shilling.]

LETTER

TO THE

RIGHT REVEREND THE

LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER;

IN WHICH

The Divine Legation of America

IS VINDICATED.



MANUSCRIPT DEPARTMENT

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BISHOP:

AND

His Lordship's Manuscripts as a WRITER

AND

To be the Record to the LINCOLN

OF HIS

WARRIORS AND

His Lordship's Manuscripts as a WRITER

AND

YAC.

L O N D O N

Printed by W. G. Smith, in the Strand, in 18

18

[Price One Shilling]

*To the Right Rev. the Lord
Bishop of GLOUCESTER,*

Qui Genus Humanum superavit.

MY LORD,

YOUR Lordship's great Reputation as a sincere and unprejudiced Enquirer into Truth, and amiable Character for Candour as well as Learning, embolden me to think, that you will pardon the Freedom of this Address; though it comes from one who is entirely unknown to your Lordship, and who intends at present to be unknown to the Publick. Think not, however, my Lord, that this proceeds from any Fear, lest my present Undertaking should diminish any Part of that Fame I may have acquired by former Publications. No, my Lord, had I not thought that this Letter would do Credit to its Author, it would never have been presented to the Publick, as it would, in that Case, fail of the *End* aimed at, viz. the Increase and Diffusion of your

B

Lord-

Lordship's Fame, to which my Reputation must be the *Means*. But as the Envy and Malice of the World are always attributing the *worst* Motives to the *best* Actions, and as my Situation in the Church is such, that though it may excite Envy in others, yet it may be thought not to have subdued all Ambition in me, were I to affix my Name to this Performance, this Address might be attributed to a Desire of your Lordship's Patronage, not to the real Motive, a profound Veneration for your Lordship's great Abilities. Whereas my true Reason for concealing myself is, lest your Lordship, out of your great Goodness, Condescension, and Generosity, should force me from that Lot, in which I am contented, to Stations of greater Dignity and Power, which I do not like.

You may think, perhaps, my Lord, that I am one amongst the many of whom your Lordship has made such honourable Mention in some of your illustrious Notes to some of your illustrious Publications; and, therefore, what I am now doing, is only what I am bound in Gratitude to perform. No, my Lord, I glory in my Disinterestedness; and I am not the least ashamed to confess, that I am one amongst the very few Writers of this Century, who cannot boast of an Obligation of this or any other kind from the Bishop of *Gloucester*.

Truth,

Truth, an enthusiastick Love of Truth, is the ruling Passion of my Breast, and as nothing can more obstruct its Progress, than the misunderstanding of your Lordship's Works, it is the *Akme* of my Ambition to rectify, in this Respect, the Mistake of the World. A Mistake which I have long beheld with Impatience ; as I am persuaded, Truth can never prevail, till the profoundest Reverence and the most implicit Submission be paid to your Learning and Genius, and your Lordship be universally acknowledged as the sovereign and infallible Pontiff in the World of Letters, which has been by some absurdly called a *Republic*. But how much Honour does it reflect on your Lordship, what a noble Contempt of Fame does it show, (which Quality has, indeed, ever distinguished you, and given you a Place far above all the Philosophers of *Greece* and *Rome*,) that your Lordship has beheld all the Misrepresentations of your Works, both by your Friends and Enemies, with the utmost Calmness, and the coolest Indifference, notwithstanding the many Opportunities for Revenge your Lordship has had, both as an Author and an Editor. Contempt or Resentment, which would have taken Possession of the Breast of almost any other Mortal, never entered nor discomposed your Bosom. Acrimony, and even Abuse, which would have found their Way into the Writ-

ings of almost any other Man, never stained your Page. But why should I mention what all the World knows, that Patience, Meekness, Philanthropy, all the Tenderneſſes of Humanity, and all the amiable Virtues of Christianity, are the characteriſtick Marks of your Lordſhip's Writings? But, though your Lordſhip can be thus unſollicitous about your own Fame, I cannot. The World has been long enough immerſed in Folly, it is time for it now to begin to learn Wiſdom.

Though numberleſs are the low and abuſive Pamphlets which have been written againſt your Lordſhip, *that* lately publiſhed by the preſent Biſhop of *Oxford* was never equalled in theſe Reſpects; and (if I may be allowed the Expreſſion) was ſuperior to all for its total Deſiciency in Wit and Argument. A Pamphlet which your Lordſhip, with the greateſt Truth, affirmed, "You never *did*, " and that you believe you never *ſhall* read;" but which, to give a Proof of your unprecedented Candour and Humility, you condeſcended to answer*. That Writer hints a Deſign of attacking the whole *Divine Legation*. He ſpeaks, indeed, dubiouſly, as if he were not fully determined to put it into Execution. But as it is evident he is amongſt the Number of thoſe who groſſly miſunderſtand your Lordſhip, I am reſolved,

* See *Monthly Review*, for May, 1766.

by pointing out his Mistake, and by developing the true Meaning, End, and Design of the *Divine Legation*, to save him the Trouble. And I shall leave him to exercise his Pen upon Works far less sublime, and better suited to his groveling Genius and contracted Learning.

But, my Lord, I must rely on your Lordship's *Good-nature* for Pardon, on account of the Pain your Modesty will make you feel, whilst I am informing the World what appears to me to have been your real Motive for writing that great Work, and explain all the dark *Hieroglyphics* in that Performance. A Work, which, in the Light in which I shall place it, will add new Lustre to your Lordship's Fame, and make it eclipse the Brightness of every other Writer, antient or modern. Of all Men, I would not appear vain to your Lordship; "since of all Men you best know how ill it would become my Pride*." But as I have the utmost Reason to believe that your Lordship never *initiated* any one into these *Mysteries*, my Ability to dive into them will, I hope, give you a high Opinion of the Profundity of my Genius. And as your Lordship is the great Dispenser of modern Reputation, pardon my Presumption, if I hope, that you will allow me to be classed in the Temple of Fame, next even to the celebrated Disco-

* Ded. to Lord *Mansfield*, Ed. 3d.

verer of the *Eleusinian Mysteries* in the sixth Book of the *Æneid*.

“ To live in the Voice and Memory of
 “ Men is the flattering Dream of every Ad-
 “ venturer in Letters ; and for me, who boast
 “ the rare Felicity of being honoured with
 “ the Friendship of two or three superior
 “ Characters, Men endowed with Virtue to
 “ atone for a bad Age, and of Abilities to
 “ make a bad Age a good one, for *me* not
 “ to aspire to the best Mode of this ideal
 “ Existence, the being carried down to re-
 “ mote Ages along with those who will never
 “ die, would be a strange Insensibility to hu-
 “ man Glory*.”

Inspired, therefore, by the Love of Truth, and incited likewise by the Hope of immortal Fame, I shall, without further Preface, proceed to the Discovery of your Lordship's secret Intentions in your *Divine Legation*.

That your Lordship is thoroughly versed in all the Learning of the Antients, not only in what they *did* write, but likewise in what they did *not* write, every one must know who has read your learned Dissertation on *Hieroglyphics*. That your Lordship is likewise conversant in every modern Production of *Europe*, from the most abstruse Work of Philosophy to the lowest Romance, no one, in the least acquainted with your Lordship's

* Ded. to Lord Mansfield.

Works,

Works, can possibly doubt *. That your Lordship is perfectly sensible the present State of Learning in *Europe* is so low, that the best Works are only read by a few, and even by those few soon forgotten, your *Divine Legation* alone would afford us many Proofs. For as your Lordship has yourself disclaimed all Right in Paradoxes, the many contained in that great Work can only be borrowed from other valuable Works, little known and less read. Lastly; who that is conversant in your Lordship's *Polemic* Writings; and which of your Writings are not *Polemic*? can doubt of your confessing, that the Principles of Logic, and the Art of Reasoning, are entirely uncultivated by the present Age? Nay, who can doubt that you really think there is no Opinion so absurd in itself, or which can be defended by ever so weak Arguments, which would not obtain the Approbation of many, especially if ushered into the World with Confidence, a pretended Love of Truth, and an apparent Concern for the Interests of Religion?

From these Premises, every Reader must already begin to conjecture, *what* the Conclusion is, which I am about to deduce, and your Lordship must already know that it is a true one, viz. That your real, though concealed Design, in undertaking the *Divine Legation*, was to try how a Work, con-

* See Preface to *Jarvis's Don Quixote*.

structed on the Principles I have just mentioned, would really be received by the World. Not, indeed, by chusing for a Subject an Opinion false in itself: but, with much more Art, engaging the publick Attention, by making Choice of a Subject true in itself, and generally received. Giving, however, the highest Perfection to an Undertaking of this Kind, by endeavouring to prove it through the Medium of a Proposition in the highest Degree repugnant to Reason; and by such Arguments as must appear, in the greatest Degree, weak and fallacious to every good Logician, were any such to be found in the World besides your Lordship and myself. Your Lordship's Performance, therefore, having succeeded even beyond Expectation, the Truth of the Experiment upon which it was founded, is established beyond Controversy.

For your Lordship has seen your Work at Home admired by the Many, and patronized by the Great. Abroad, quoted by the Ingenious, and translated by the Learned; whilst your Lordship, enjoying the Fruits of this Admiration and Patronage in one of the highest Dignities of the Church, sat smiling at the Encomiums of your Friends, and the Objections of your Enemies. Smiling, my Lord, to think that though your Work has attracted the Attention of all *Europe*, and your Friends and
 Enemies

Enemies have for several Years been waging War on your Account, no one has ever, before me, dived into the real Design of that Publication. But they have all, hitherto, mistaken Irony for Seriousness; Commendation for Satire; Sophistry for Argument; and Ridicule for Reason. The *former* proving themselves *Fools*, by reasoning *wrong* from *right* Principles: Concluding, that *because* your Lordship cannot *err*, *therefore* the Arguments in the *Divine Legation* must be *good* *. The *latter*, according to Mr. *Locke's* Definition, proving themselves *Mad-men*, by reasoning *right* from *wrong* Principles. For they, taking for granted that your Lordship was serious, concluded, that *because* your Book contained *bad Logic*, *therefore* your Lordship was in an Error.

But in the Light in which I have now placed your Work, which, I am persuaded, is the only true one, how do your Abilities beam forth with unrivaled Lustre! What a surprizing Ductility of Genius do you exhibit! How almost incredible is it, that one of such extensive Learning should so well perform the Part of a Smatterer, and that the ablest Reasoner in the World should personate so naturally the Character of a Sophist.

* Sorry I am, that I cannot except out of this Number the truly learned and ingenious Annotator on *The Art of Poetry*, &c. whose Mistake in this Point is the only Impeachment of his critical Abilities.

My Hypothesis, however, will not, I doubt, make its Way in the World without great Difficulty and much Opposition, especially as your Lordship's uncommon Modesty will, I fear, prevent you from giving the World an indisputable Confirmation of its Truth. I shall, therefore, not content myself with only *proposing* it as a reasonable Conjecture, but proceed to prove its Certainty. Not from any of those great, but incidental Positions, whether *Theological*, or *Moral*, or *Civil*, or *Political*, or *Critical*, &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. &c. which surround the one great central Proposition, but from the very *fundamental Principles* of your renowned *Cyclopædia*. To which not only your Friends have unanimously assented, but which not even your *Enemies* have called in Question.

Your Lordship's first Syllogism, I think, stands thus :

Whatsoever Religion and Society have not a future State for their *Support*, must be supported by an *extraordinary Providence*.

The *Jewish* Religion and Society had not a future State for their Support :

Therefore the *Jewish* Religion and Society were supported by an extraordinary Providence.

Thus, then, I “*erect my Demonstration**.”

* *Div. Leg.* Page 7.

What-

Whatsoever Proposition and Demonstration of the Bishop of *Gloucester's* have not Reason for their Support, must be supported by Ridicule.

But the Bishop of *Gloucester's* Propositions and Demonstrations in the *Divine Legation* have not Reason for their Support:

Therefore the Bishop of *Gloucester's* Propositions and Demonstrations are supported by Ridicule.

Now, my Lord, notwithstanding "*Man's great Love to Paradox and System**," I shall take for granted, that no Libertine or Unbeliever will have the Effrontery to deny my *Major*. For as to your Lordship's Adversaries, such as a *Lowth*, a *Rutherford*, a *Sykes*, a *Bott*, a *Peter*, or a *Stebbing*, they are People whose Objections are not worthy of Notice. Your Lordship having yourself, in your Preface to *Pope's Works*, observed, with your usual Modesty, that that Poet, with his Works, bequeathed you his *Dunces*. But, my Lord, to justify myself still further in not condescending to obviate any Objections your Enemies may urge, permit me to transcribe a celebrated Passage, from the Preface to your fourth Volume of the *Divine Legation*.

"Who has not signalized himself against
"the *Divine Legation*? Bigots, Hutchin-

* *Div. Leg.* Page 8.

“sonians, Methodists, Answerers, Free-
 “thinkers, and Fanatics, have, in their
 “Turns, been all up in Arms against it.
 “The Scene was opened by a false Zealot,
 “and, at present, seems likely to be closed
 “by a Behmenist. A natural and easy
 “Progress from Folly to Madness. It was
 “now Time to settle my Accounts with
 “them. To this End, I applied to a
 “learned Person, who, in consideration of
 “our Friendship, has been prevailed upon
 “to undergo the Drudgery of turning over
 “this dirty Heap, and marking what he
 “imagined would, in the least, deserve, or
 “could justify, any Notice: For I would
 “not have the Reader conceive so miserably
 “of me, as to think I was ever disposed to
 “look into them myself. He will find, as
 “he goes along, both in the Text and
 “Notes, what was thought least unworthy
 “of an Answer. Nor let it give him too
 “much Scandal, that, in a Work which I
 “have now put into as good a Condition
 “for him as I was able, I have revived the
 “Memory of the numerous and gross Ab-
 “surdities of these Writers, Part of whom
 “are dead, and the rest forgotten; for he
 “will consider, that it may prove an useful
 “Barrier to the Return of the like Follies
 “in after Times, against more successful
 “Enquirers into Truth *.”

* *Div. Leg.* Page 40. Ed. 3d.

Now,

Now, my Lord, as I should likewise be very sorry *if the Reader should conceive so miserably of me*, as to think *I am disposed to turn over so dirty a Heap*, I shall not condescend to touch it. And, indeed, as your Lordship has, with the greatest Humility, condescended, for the Benefit of Posterity, to fill your Ship with it, which, with its Sails,

“ Expanded flies, and gathers all its Fame,”

why should I incumber and pollute my little Bark, which

“ attendant sails,

“ Pursues the Triumph, and partakes the Gales?”

I shall, therefore, take the *major Proposition* for granted. But as many “ *Bigots amongst Believers may deny the Minor*,” this I shall proceed to prove, viz. *That the Bishop of Gloucester's Propositions and Demonstrations have not Reason for their Support.*

Your Lordship's *major Proposition* may be divided into *two*, as it contains two Subjects, *Religion* and *Society*. I shall consider it first as it concerns *Religion*.

But as most of our Errors proceed from a Want of Definitions, I shall begin with defining the principal Words in the Syllogism. For it may justly be expected, that when so able a Reasoner as your Lordship mean to err, that you will hide your Intention where others most frequently err *undesignedly*.

The

The Word Religion implies the Discharge of Man's Duty to God, or Obedience to his Laws. But as Man must have some Motive to engage him to the Performance of every Action, and as none can induce *him* to pay Obedience to any Law except the Hope of Reward or the Fear of Punishment, the Practice of Religion must be founded on the Expectation of God's Infliction of Punishments, or his bestowing of Rewards. The Place in which these Punishments and Rewards are expected to be conferred must be either *this* World or the *next*. The Expectation of them in the *former* must be founded in the Doctrine of a *Providence*: In the *latter*, on the Notion of a *future State*. A Thing is said to be the *Support* of another, when it is the Cause of its *Preservation*, or *Continuance* in Being.

From the foregoing Definitions, then, it necessarily follows; that as the Practice of Religion must be founded on the Expectation, either of *present* or *future* Rewards and Punishments; and as these Expectations are built either on the Belief of the Doctrines of a *Providence* or of a *future State*; Religion may be *supported*, or *exist*, on the Belief of *either* of these Doctrines. Consequently likewise, that wheresoever Religion is *not* supported by a Belief in *one* of them, it *must* be supported by Faith in the *other*.

The

The Providence of God is generally divided into *two* Kinds: *ordinary* and *extraordinary*. The *former*, as it respects Religion, signifies the Care the Deity has taken to reward the Good, and to punish the Wicked, by that Series of Events, which he has established in the common Course of Nature. The *latter* may imply the Care of the Deity in bestowing greater Rewards on the Good, and Punishments on the Wicked, by Events *contrary* to the Course of Nature. Or the extraordinary Providence of God, in the Preservation of Religion, may likewise consist, in giving Men Manifestations of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

But as it is evident, that all Religion must be founded either on the Belief of present or future Rewards and Punishments, all the miraculous Interpositions of Deity, or the Agency of an extraordinary Providence, must ultimately tend to the Confirmation of Men's Faith in one or both of these Doctrines.

If it be objected, " that Religion cannot
 " be supported on the Belief of *present* Re-
 " wards and Punishments resulting from
 " the ordinary Providence of God, because
 " it is pretended, that Experience shows
 " the Good are sometimes unsuccessful and
 " the Bad prosperous ;" I answer, first, that
 taking this Objection according to the *strict*
 Meaning

Meaning of the Words, it does not in the least impugn my Position. For Men may be *successful* and yet *miserable, unsuccessful* and yet *contented*. But if it be meant, that the Good are sometimes *unhappy* and the *Wicked* are *sometimes happy*, then, so far is it from destroying, that it establishes the *Truth* of my *Position* in *general*. And however the *All-sufficiency* of *Virtue* to *Happiness* may be denied by some, yet it must be evident to all, that *Virtue* encreases and *Vice* diminishes a Man's *Happiness* in every *Situation* of *Life*. Which *Belief* is sufficient for the *Support* or mere *Existence* of *Religion*. Secondly, *History* evinces, that the *Belief* of *Rewards* and *Punishments* in this *Life* always has, and *Experience* evinces that it does now, make so considerable a *Part* of the *Well-being* of *Religion*, that it would *alone* support its *Being*.

That the *Religion* will have a *stronger* *Support* which is founded likewise on the *Expectation* of *future* as well as *present Rewards and Punishments*, is certain. That *future Rewards and Punishments*, therefore, may be proved necessary to the *Well-being*, if by that be meant the better *Being* of a *Religion*, is evident. But in the same *Manner* may the *Belief* of *present Rewards and Punishments* be proved necessary to the better *Being* of a *Religion*, which has the *Belief*

Belief of *future* Rewards and Punishments for its Support.

From these Premises it will appear demonstratively certain, that so able a Reasoner as the Bishop of *Gloucester*, could never seriously intend to deduce the *Divine Legation* of *Moses* through this Medium, his omitting to inculcate the Doctrine of a Future State. For such an Attempt would be totally inconsistent with Reason. As, first, in respect to your Lordship's *major* Proposition. It is so far from being true, "That whatsoever Religion has not a *Future State* for its Support, must be supported by an *extraordinary* Providence;" that it follows, from the foregoing Reasoning, a Religion which is not supported by a Future State, may be supported by a Belief in the *ordinary* Method of God's *Providence*. Your Lordship's Syllogism, therefore, should have stood thus :

A Religion may be supported either on the Belief of a Future State; or, secondly, on the Belief of the *ordinary*; or, thirdly, on the *extraordinary* Method of God's Providence, in distributing Rewards and Punishments in this World.

But the *Jewish* Religion had not the Belief of a Future State for its Support :

Therefore the *Jewish* Religion might be supported either on the Belief of God's *ordinary* or *extraordinary* Providence.

D

Who

due ~~him~~ to pay Obedience to any Law except the Hope of Reward or the Fear of Punishment, the Practice of Religion must be founded on the Expectation of God's Infliction of Punishments, or his bestowing of Rewards. The Place in which these Punishments and Rewards are expected to be conferred must be either *this* World or the *next*. The Expectation of them in the *former* must be founded in the Doctrine of a *Providence*: In the *latter*, on the Notion of a *future State*. A Thing is said to be the *Support* of another, when it is the Cause of its *Preservation*, or *Continuance* in Being.

From the foregoing Definitions, then, it necessarily follows; that as the Practice of Religion must be founded on the Expectation, either of *present* or *future* Rewards and Punishments; and as these Expectations are built either on the Belief of the Doctrines of a *Providence* or of a *future State*; Religion may be *supported*, or *exist*, on the Belief of *either* of these Doctrines. Consequently likewise, that wheresoever Religion is *not* supported by a Belief in *one* of them, it *must* be supported by Faith in the *other*.

The

Wicked, by that Series of Events, which he has established in the common Course of Nature. The *latter* may imply the Care of the Deity in bestowing greater Rewards on the Good, and Punishments on the Wicked, by Events *contrary* to the Course of Nature. Or the extraordinary Providence of God, in the Preservation of Religion, may likewise consist, in giving Men Manifestations of a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

But as it is evident, that all Religion must be founded either on the Belief of present or future Rewards and Punishments, all the miraculous Interpositions of Deity, or the Agency of an extraordinary Providence, must ultimately tend to the Confirmation of Men's Faith in one or both of these Doctrines.

If it be objected, " that Religion cannot
" be supported on the Belief of *present* Re-
" wards and Punishments resulting from
" the ordinary Providence of God, because
" it is pretended, that Experience shows
" the Good are sometimes unsuccessful and
" the Bad prosperous ;" I answer, first, that
taking this Objection according to the *strict*
Meaning

Meaning of the Words, it does not in the least impugn my Position. For Men may be *successful* and yet *miserable, unsuccessful* and yet *contented*. But if it be meant, that the Good are sometimes *unhappy* and the *Wicked* are *sometimes happy*, then, so far is it from destroying, that it establishes the *Truth* of my *Position* in *general*. And however the *All-sufficiency* of *Virtue* to *Happiness* may be denied by some, yet it must be evident to all, that *Virtue* encreases and *Vice* diminishes a Man's *Happiness* in every *Situation* of *Life*. Which *Belief* is sufficient for the *Support* or mere *Existence* of *Religion*. Secondly, *History* evinces, that the *Belief* of *Rewards* and *Punishments* in this *Life* always has, and *Experience* evinces that it does now, make so considerable a *Part* of the *Well-being* of *Religion*, that it would *alone* support its *Being*.

That the *Religion* will have a *stronger* *Support* which is founded likewise on the *Expectation* of *future* as well as *present* *Rewards* and *Punishments*, is certain. That *future* *Rewards* and *Punishments*, therefore, may be proved necessary to the *Well-being*, if by that be meant the better *Being* of a *Religion*, is evident. But in the same *Manner* may the *Belief* of *present* *Rewards* and *Punishments* be proved necessary to the better *Being* of a *Religion*, which has the
Belief

Belief of *future* Rewards and Punishments for its Support.

From these Premises it will appear demonstratively certain, that so able a Reasoner as the Bishop of *Gloucester*, could never seriously intend to deduce the *Divine Legation* of *Moses* through this Medium, his omitting to inculcate the Doctrine of a Future State. For such an Attempt would be totally inconsistent with Reason. As, first, in respect to your Lordship's *major* Proposition. It is so far from being true, "That whatsoever Religion has not a *Future State* for its Support, must be supported by an *extraordinary* Providence;" that it follows, from the foregoing Reasoning, a Religion which is not supported by a Future State, may be supported by a Belief in the *ordinary* Method of God's *Providence*. Your Lordship's Syllogism, therefore, should have stood thus :

A Religion may be supported either on the Belief of a Future State; or, secondly, on the Belief of the *ordinary*; or, thirdly, on the *extraordinary* Method of God's Providence, in distributing Rewards and Punishments in this World.

But the *Jewish* Religion had not the Belief of a Future State for its Support :

Therefore the *Jewish* Religion might be supported either on the Belief of God's *ordinary* or *extraordinary* Providence.

D

Who

Who would not have joined your Lordship in a Laugh, had any one *seriously* proposed such an Argument in Defence of the *Divine Legation* of *Moses*? Who then can but admire your Lordship's infinite Humour in proposing it *jocosely*, and your wonderful Dexterity likewise in concealing the Fallacy from View?

If it should be pretended by the *Bigots*, that your Lordship did not mean by the Word *Support*, the mere *Being* of a Religion, but its *Well-being*, or most perfect Existence, and, by the *extraordinary* Providence of God, only his *ordinary* Providence, as I have explained it above, this will avail them nothing. For the Absurdity still remaining, the Truth of my Hypothesis is equally apparent. According to this Interpretation of the Words, it would follow, that "whatsoever Religion is not supported by a *Future State*, must be supported by an *extraordinary* Providence," is so far from being a true Proposition, that *no Religion can be supported by the Belief either of a Future State, or an extraordinary Providence, singly, but only by both, conjointly*. These Bigots, therefore, would, by their Interpretation of your Lordship's Words, make you the serious Author of a still more absurd Argument than the foregoing. For if their Interpretation be admitted,

mitted, the real Meaning of the Syllogism would be this :

No Religion *can* be supported, but on the Belief of a Future State and of an extraordinary Providence *conjointly*.

The *Jewish* Religion had not the Belief of a Future State for its Support :

Therefore the *Jewish* Religion *was* supported by the Belief of an extraordinary Providence.

Now this, it must be confessed, if it had more Art, would be by far the pleasanter Species of ironical Argument : For it directly destroys the Position it is brought to support. But to suppose that your Lordship could ever seriously advance such an Argument, would be shocking to Reason ; though your Friends perpetually do it. For how successful are they in confirming the Truth of my Hypothesis, even when they zealously endeavour to explode it.

Again, if it be said, that by the Word *Support* the *Well-being* of a Religion is to be understood, and the Words, "*Extraordinary Providence*" are to be taken in their strict Sense, then even granting that a Religion must be supported by an Extraordinary Providence, which is not supported by a Future State, yet, the *Divine Legation* of *Moses* can never appear from his omitting to inculcate the latter Notion, only

upon this Supposition: *That a Religion will be better supported by the Belief of an Extraordinary Providence singly, than by it and the Belief of a Future State conjointly.* For unless *this* be supposed, nay, unless this Supposition be true, the omitting to inculcate a Future State would be so far from proving *Moses* to have had a *Divine Legation*, that no other Proof would be wanted of the contrary. According to this Interpretation of the Words, your Lordship, on their Hypothesis, ought to have added the following Syllogism:

A Religion is better supported on the Belief of an Extraordinary Providence *singly*, than on that and a Future State conjointly.

The *Jewish* Religion had not a Future State, only an Extraordinary Providence for its Support:

Therefore it was better supported, than if it had been supported by an Extraordinary Providence and a Future State conjointly.

But, my Lord, if this *was* your Meaning, your Lordship's *Omission* of this Syllogism could not more strongly evince the Truth of my Hypothesis, than the *Addition* of it.

Lastly, Let your Lordship's Words be taken in any Sense they can possibly bear, and even granting that a Religion can *not* be supported on the Belief only, of the
Ordi-

Ordinary Providence of God, which I have proved it *can*; it would, by no means, follow, that "whatsoever Religion had not a Future State for its Support, must be supported by an Extraordinary Providence." For, from the foregoing Reasoning, it appears, that not the *real Existence* of a Future State, or of an Extraordinary Providence, but only the *Belief* of them, is necessary to the Support of Religion. Adding, therefore, to the Concessions already made another, in favour of your Lordship's Minor, the Syllogism could only stand thus:

Whatsoever Religion is not supported by the Belief of a Future State, must be supported by the *Belief* of an Extraordinary Providence.

But the *Jewish* Religion was not supported by the *Belief* of a Future State:

Therefore it was supported by the *Belief* of an Extraordinary Providence.

But even then, my Lord, how should we ever arrive, by serious Argumentation, at the Conclusion required, "That the *Jews* were *really* supported by an Extraordinary Providence." To infer that because the *Jews were really* supported by an Extraordinary Providence, therefore they *believed* they were, might, indeed, appear tolerably plausible, did we not know, that though the former was a Fact, yet the latter did not
always

always follow from it? But to conclude, that because a People *believed* their Religion was, therefore it was *really* supported by an Extraordinary Providence, is an Inference, which, however seriously it might be deduced by your Friends, would never seriously be admitted by your Lordship. It could be applied by your Lordship to no other Purpose, than as an ironical Defence of all the Superstitions in the World, whether founded on the Absurdities of *Paganism*, or grafted on the pure Stock of *Christianity*.

Your Lordship and the Publick will, I hope, pardon my Prolixity on the first Subject of your major Proposition, *Religion*, as what is said upon *that*, is equally applicable to the other Subject, *Society*. But the latter is not only liable to the same Objections with the former, but it admits likewise of one peculiar to itself. For though the Belief either of a Providence, or a Future State, is absolutely necessary to the Subsistence of *Religion*, they are not to the Being of *Society*. For *that* may exist, or be supported, merely by human Laws, though not so comfortably as if both or either the other Motives were added. And, indeed, it is amazing, that, notwithstanding, my Lord, your Work has been published so many Years, yet it should *now* be left to me, at this Time, to propose my Hypothesis. For your Lordship, knowing how impos-

sible

fible it was to bring the least Shadow of an
 Argument to prove the Truth of your major
 Proposition, as it respects Society, instead of
 showing that the inculcating the Doctrine
 of a Future State of Rewards and Punish-
 ments is necessary to its *Support*, your Lord-
 ship, with infinite Humour, only attempts
 to show that it is necessary to its *Well-being*.
 How astonishing, therefore! how almost
 incredible is it! that, when your Lordship
 gave your Readers so fine an Opening to
 discover the exquisite Art and Contrivance
 of your whole Work, that no one before
 me should ever have perceived it. For
 granting, that the former Position is true,
 viz. "that the Belief of a Future State is
 "necessary to the *Support* of Society;" yet,
 as your Lordship hath not attempted to
 prove it, to suppose that you meant your
 Work for a serious Example of solid Rea-
 soning, would be a Supposition in the highest
 Degree incongruous to Reason. For your
 Lordship would then have left unproved the
 very fundamental Principle of your whole
 Work. And granting, that your Lordship
hath proved the Truth of the latter Position,
 viz. that the Belief of a Future State is
 necessary to the *Well-being* of Society, it
 would be nothing to the Purpose. For this
 is a Proposition totally different from *that*,
 your Lordship would, upon that Hypothesis,
 have been under a Necessity of proving.

Is

Is it not, therefore, a Mystery totally inexplicable by any Hypothesis but mine, that your Lordship should make one Proposition the fundamental Principle of your Work, and then amuse your Readers by an Attempt to prove another? For will any one have the Effrontery to affirm, that a Writer of your Lordship's Learning and Abilities could seriously imagine, that Propositions so different are the same. Or, what is still more shocking, that one of your Lordship's Candour and Integrity, would seriously attempt to impose one upon the World for the other? Or, lastly, that one with your Lordship's known Diffidence and Modesty, could seriously imagine, that *all* the World beside yourself would ignorantly mistake, and blindly assent to, one Proposition not proved, because your Lordship had proved another.

Having given such ample Proof, that the whole of your Lordship's Syllogism is so totally irreconcilable with Reason, that even admitting the Truth of the *Minor*, the *Consequent* does not follow from it: I shall not enter into any Scrutiny of the many very ingenious sophistical Arguments by which your Lordship endeavours to establish that Proposition. For it is not my Design to fatigue your Lordship and the Publick, by the Repetition of Arguments which have
been

been before advanced, but only to offer such as have occurred to me, and escaped others *.

And it must be confessed, that even your Lordship's Enemies have, by some Means, blundered into a right Apprehension, that your *minor* Proposition is not founded on Reason; though their Intellects were too weak to proceed to the true Conclusion, that your Lordship, therefore, was *not serious*, but *jocose*.

But I cannot forbear to observe, (for Justice is due even to your Lordship's Enemies,) that the same Repugnance which *I* have shewn between your *Minor* and *Consequent*, from the Principles of Religion in *general*, they have pointed out from a particular Fact relative to the *Jewish*. It is an indisputable Fact, that the *Jews* were not kept in Obedience. How, therefore, they ask, can it be consistent with the *Divine Legation of Moses*, that when *present* Rewards and Punishments failed, he should omit to inculcate the other Motive to Obedience, the Belief of a *future* State, if this had not previously obtained amongst them? To urge that there can be no Doubt that it was right to omit it, because numberless Instances may be brought to prove *Moses's*

* For a new Objection to the Minor, see *Critical Review*, Feb. 1766.

Wisdom and Goodness, would plainly discover the Irony of the Reasoner. For as this one Omission would be a demonstrative Proof of his Want either of Goodness or Wisdom in the fundamental Principles of Legislation, a thousand other Instances of his possessing these Qualities could not destroy it. Nay, indeed, every other Instance of his Wisdom or Goodness, whether merely as Man, or as being favoured with a Divine Communication, would be a Proof, that he could omit the Doctrine of a Future State, only because it was before generally believed. For what should we think of the Goodness of a Physician, who had two Prescriptions; one of which alone would preserve the Constitutions of his Patients in tolerable good Health, but both together, in the most perfect Health of which human Nature is capable; if he should prescribe only one to a Patient, who was not before in Possession of the other?

Though, my Lord, I have established the Truth of my Hypothesis beyond Confutation, only from the Consideration of your *first* Syllogism, I will proceed to demonstrate it as clearly from your Lordship's *second*. That the Bigots being deprived of every the least Pretence to Argument, it may be apparent to every Eye, that their Rejection of my Hypothesis can
proceed

proceed only from Obstinacy. Your Lordship says,

The antient Lawgivers universally believed, that such a Religion can be supported only by an Extraordinary Providence.

Moses, who instituted such a Religion, was an antient Lawgiver :

Therefore *Moses* believed his Religion was supported by an Extraordinary Providence.

How frequently must so excellent a Logician as your Lordship have laughed to see, that though *all* your Enemies denied the *Major* of this Syllogism, yet that *none* of them have ever, in so many Years, disputed the Legality of its Construction. But, on the contrary, they have all assented to the Legality of its Form, as if it were built upon the same self-evident Principles as the common one,

Every Man is an Animal;

Peter is a Man,

Therefore *Peter* is an Animal.

Your Lordship had seen, that on Account of the many idle Subtilties of the Schoolmen, latter Ages had too much neglected even the most useful Parts of the excellent Science of Logick. With your usual Art and Address, my Lord, you took Advantage

of this Neglect, and tried, whether the World would distinguish a *Similarity* from an *Identity* of Form. For the categorical Form is perfect, when there is a necessary Connexion between the *Subject* and the *Predicate* of the *Major* Proposition, *i. e.* when the *Predicate* is implied in the *Definition* of the *Subject*, as in the latter Syllogism, "Every Man is an Animal." But your Lordship thought, and Experience has shewn you were not mistaken, that a Syllogism of similar Construction, without this necessary Connexion, would pass off undetected by many. The Attempt was, indeed, exquisitely ingenious, but it was the Greatness of its Ingenuity which prevented its Discovery, to the Honour of your Lordship's Abilities. Your Adversaries did not perceive, that, though in perfect Form, the *Minor* necessarily presupposes the Truth of the *Major*; in your Lordship's, the *Major* cannot be admitted, unless the Truth of the *Minor* be first established.

Left, however, any, from Envy of your Lordship's stupendous Genius, should insist, that your *Syllogism* is strictly logical, when it displays the finest Instance of your Skill in Sophistry; I shall beg Leave to borrow a Proposition for my *Major* from another Part of your Work, and produce a Syllogism exactly of the *same* Form with your Lordship's,

ship's, to prove the Truth of a Proposition directly repugnant to that for which you brought yours. The Syllogism is this :

“ None of the antient Philosophers believed the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments, though they sedulously taught it the People.”

But *Moses* was an antient Philosopher :

Therefore *Moses* did not believe the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments, though he sedulously taught it the People.

Thus you see, my Lord, I have directly proved, that *Moses* did inculcate the Belief of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments, by an Argument exactly of the same Kind as your Lordship's. Not, my Lord, that I have the Vanity to pretend, I have here discovered an Argument which had escaped you. For I do not doubt, but your Lordship was aware of it yourself, only it did not suit your Purpose to form it into a Syllogism. Should any one pretend that there is this Difference between the two Syllogisms ; that *Moses* was really an “ Antient Lawgiver, but not a Philosopher ;” how would your Lordship laugh to think, that any one should have Faith in the *Divine Legation* of *Moses*, and yet deny him
to

to have been a *Philosopher*, or a *Lover of Truth*.

Having thus proved, by several Demonstrations, each of which is not only “as strong, but as short too, as any of Euclid’s*,” that the *Bishop of Gloucester’s Propositions and Demonstrations are not supported by Reason*, the Conclusion follows of course, *that his Lordship’s Propositions, &c. are supported by Ridicule of Modern Reasoning*.

It will, however, perhaps, be objected, for Modern Reasoners frequently urge Objections from *Conjecture* against *Demonstration*, that, had it been your Lordship’s Intention to have ridiculed Modern Reasoning from your Regard to Religion, you would not have made Choice of the Divine Legation of *Moses* for your Subject. But, my Lord, how weak is such an Objection! For what Injury could Religion receive from your Choice of a Subject; the Truth of which is so evident from Arguments within the Reach of the meanest Capacity. And how could your Lordship have made the Experiment so well on any other Subject, as a religious one, which engrosses the Attention, not only of every Sect of *Christians*, but likewise of every Kind of Unbelievers. But so far is the Choice of

* Taken from the *Divine Legation*.

the Subject from impugning, that it alone would be sufficient to establish my Hypothesis. For can any one in his Senses believe, that your Lordship would seriously spend the greater Part of your important Life in writing *five large Octavo* Volumes, to prove the Divine Legation of *Moses*, when you know, my Lord, that a full Demonstration of this Point may be contained in five *small Pages* of the *smallest Duodecimo*?

Had I, my Lord, only Reason, and not *Prejudice* likewise to encounter, I should not have the least Doubt, but that such an Accumulation of Proofs of the Truth of my Hypothesis would produce Conviction in every Mind. But that some Bigots will refuse their Assent to them, is not only what I expect, but it is likewise no more than what I desire. For the Opposition of Bigotry is a certain Criterion of Truth. The Party, however, my Lord, from which I expect the greatest Obstruction, strange as it may at first Sight appear to some, is from your Lordship yourself. For, in your Dedication to the late Lord *Hardwicke*, you say; “As an Author I am not solicitous
 “for the Reputation of any literary Per-
 “formance. A Work given to the World
 “every Reader has a Right to censure.
 “If it has Merit it will go down to Po-
 “sterity:

“ sterity : If it has none, the sooner it
 “ dies and is forgot the better.” From this
 total Indifference to Fame, I am afraid
 your Lordship will refuse to confess, that
 my Hypothesis is true. A Confirmation
 of its Truth devoutly to be wished. And,
 my Lord, I suspect, from your uncommon
 Modesty, that your Lordship will not be
 content merely to withhold your Confirma-
 tion from an Hypothesis, which, if *Exoteric*,
 would redound so much to your Lordship’s
 Honour, (but that to endeavour to continue
 it *Esoteric* *,) your Lordship will even
 condescend to oppose it with the same Vein
 of Irony which runs so beautifully through
 your whole *Divine Legation*. If this should
 be the Case, as indeed it must be, for
 your Lordship to be consistent with yourself,
 I shall think it a Duty, which I owe to
 Truth and your Reputation, to enter the
 Lists, with your Lordship, in Defence of
 my Hypothesis. And armed with Truth
 and Reason, I shall have no Dread of a
 “ dishonourable Grave,” but undauntedly
 approach even an Host of Adversaries,
 though led to Battle by a *Goliath*. For, my
 Lord, so earnestly do I desire, and so zea-
 lous am I in the Endeavour to diffuse your
 Lordship’s Fame, that, not content with

* See this Distinction relative to the Tenets of the An-
 cient Philosophers in *The Divine Legation*.

my present Proofs of my Hypothesis, from an Examination of your *fundamental* Propositions ; I shall, in some future Works, clearly deduce the same from your *incidental* ones. And notwithstanding the Pain it may give your Modesty, as it is a Modesty, my Lord, which is injurious to the Interests of Truth, and your Lordship's Glory, I shall take all the Care in my Power, that every one of these Proofs be transmitted down to the latest Posterity ; and that they be enrolled amongst the Volumes of everlasting Fame.

It would be utterly unpardonable, my Lord, in any one who had the least Regard to the Welfare of his Country and the Interests of Religion, to conclude an Address of this Kind, without expressing his Wishes that your Lordship may rise from your present Situation, to the highest Dignity the Church has to bestow. Who that knows how intimately your Lordship is versed in all the Legislations of the Antients, all the Politics of the Moderns, and in all the *Utopian* Schemes of Government both antient and modern, can forbear to lament, that you, my Lord, have a Place only in the great Assembly of the Nation ; when, if admitted likewise to the Cabinet, the most salutary Effects might be expected from your Lordship's Guidance. For who

F

can

can sufficiently admire the noble Concern for, and thorough Knowledge of, the established Religion and political Interests of this Kingdom, which your Lordship so eminently displayed in your Objections to the Naturalization of the *Jews*. How justly did your Lordship imagine, that if that Bill had not been repealed, the *Introduction* of so many *Foreigners* would have starved our own *Countrymen*, that *Jewish Infidelity* would have destroyed the *Christian Faith*, that *human Laws* would have abolished a *divine Legislation*, and that the *Skill of Man* would have frustrated the *Predictions of God* *. But, my Lord, great and conspicuous as are your Merits, much I fear that they will never be properly rewarded. And even from your Lordship's own Writings my gloomy Presages arise. For it is evident, that it is your Lordship's own Opinion, I do not mean altogether from your famous Sermon, but likewise from your other Works, that Rewards of Merit are not to be expected. What, but to satirize the Neglect of most Governors, especially of our own, in this Respect, could be your Lordship's Design, in your exquisitely facetious Proof, that the Distribution of Rewards can make no Part of Civil Government? Ironically maintaining it by these

* See Dedication to *Jews*, D. L. Vol. III.

Arguments : *First*, " *That Society could not distinguish the Objects of its Favour, because, their Motives cannot be known* *."

Whereas your Lordship knew that the same Argument would equally have availed to the Exclusion likewise of Punishment. For as in the latter Case it is sufficient, a Man does by Design, not by Accident, an Injury ; so, in the former, it is enough that he does by Design, not by Accident, a Benefit to Society.

Secondly, " *That Society could not reward, though it should discover the Objects of its Favour, because (as all Rewards must be pecuniary) no Society can ever find a Sum sufficient without raising it on the People as a Tax, to pay it back to them as a Reward.*"

How humorous is your Lordship's Reasoning ! how keen your Satire ! But though the former makes me laugh, yet, the Moment I reflect on the Justness of the latter, and that the Object of it may affect your Lordship, my Mirth vanishes, and Grief takes Possession of my Breast. For from the following Paragraph it is evident, that it is your Lordship's Opinion not only that Merit is not rewarded, but likewise that the Want of it is the only Way to Preferment and Honours. " *In the Course of forty or fifty Years a new Generation or two are sprung up ; and those whom their*

* See D. L. Vol. I. Section 2.

“ Profession has dedicated to this Service,
 “ (*Religion,*) *Experience* has taught, that
 “ the Talents required for pushing their
 “ Fortune, lies very remote from what en-
 “ ables Men to figure in a successful De-
 “ fence of Revelation. And it is very na-
 “ tural to think, that in general they will
 “ be chiefly bent to cultivate those Quali-
 “ ties on which they see their Patrons lay
 “ the greatest Strefs.” Since such are your
 Lordship’s Sentiments, I have but one Con-
 solation; which arises from the old Adage,
 “ That there is no general Rule without
 “ an Exception.” That a *Secker*, a *Drum-*
mond, a *Terrick*, a *Trevor*, a *Hume*, a *Lowth*,
 a *Cornwallis*, a *Newton*, a *Young*, a *Green*,
 a *Moss*, &c. &c. &c. should sit on the Bench
 of Bishops, might indeed be thought no
 great Wonder, though your Observation held
universally true. But if this were the Case,
 that your Lordship should have a Place a-
 mong them would be impossible. If, there-
 fore, your Lordship be an Exception to the
 general Rule, by your Promotion to your
 present Station, why may you not likewise
 be the same by your Advancement to the
 highest Dignity the Church has to bestow?
 Long, therefore, very long may it be, be-
 fore your Lordship be translated from Earth
 to Heaven, to exchange a terrestrial Mitre
 for a celestial Crown, and the highest reason-
 ing

ing Powers of Man for the Intuition of an
Angel.

I am, my LORD,
With the profoundest Respect,
Your LORDSHIP'S
most devoted,
and most humble Servant,

A. C. R.

F I N I S.

(27)
Angels of Power of Man for the Intuition of an

I am, my Lord,

With the profoundest respect,

Your obedient servant,

Most devoted,

50059

A. C. N.

1 1 1 1 1 1 1

